

# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

PPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/993,619	11/27/2001	Fumio Abe	1190-0531P	8233
2292	7590 07/18/2003			
BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH PO BOX 747			EXAMINER	
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747			COLON, GERMAN	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2879	
			DATE MAILED: 07/18/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	,	Application No.	Applicant(s)
•		09/993,619	ABE ET AL.
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
		German Colón	2879
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app r Reply	pears on the cover sheet with th	e correspondence address
	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL	Y IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONT	TH(S) FROM
- Exter after: - If the - If NO - Failur - Any re	MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. sions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of the total period for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute apply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing dipatent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	y within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS for cause the application to become ABANDO	days will be considered timely. rom the mailing date of this communication. DNED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
1)🖂	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 A	Anril 2003	
2a)□		is action is non-final.	
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowa	ance except for formal matters	
Dispositi	closed in accordance with the practice under on of Claims	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 1	1, 453 O.G. 213.
4)⊠	Claim(s) $1-4$ is/are pending in the application.		
•	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra	wn from consideration.	
5)	Claim(s) is/are allowed.		
6)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1-4</u> is/are rejected.		
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.		
, —	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	r election requirement.	
Applicati	on Papers		
•	The specification is objected to by the Examine		
10) 🔲 🗆	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ acce	-	
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the		
11)[7	The proposed drawing correction filed on		proved by the Examiner.
	If approved, corrected drawings are required in re	•	
,—	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer.	
-	nder 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120		
• •	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	n priority under 35 U.S.C. § 11	9(a)-(d) or (f).
a)[	☑ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:		
	1. Certified copies of the priority document	s have been received.	
	2. Certified copies of the priority document	s have been received in Applic	cation No
* 0	<ol> <li>Copies of the certified copies of the prio application from the International Bu ee the attached detailed Office action for a list</li> </ol>	reau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	_
	cknowledgment is made of a claim for domesti	·	
•	) ☐ The translation of the foreign language pro		
15) 🗌 <i>A</i>	acknowledgment is made of a claim for domest	ic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§	120 and/or 121.
Attachmen	c(s)		
2) 🔲 Notic	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _	5) Notice of Inform	nary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) nal Patent Application (PTO-152)



Art Unit: 2879

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

#### Response to Amendment

- 1. The Amendment, filed on April 30, 2003, has been entered and acknowledged by the Examiner.
- 2. Addition of claims 3 and 4 has been entered.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
  - The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.
- 4. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The claim (lines 6-16) comprises the limitation of "when a preceding one of adjacent layers is formed, the conductor is routed through a preceding one of adjacent ones of the plurality of second grooves and a preceding one of adjacent ones of the plurality of third grooves, and when a following one of the adjacent layers is formed, the conductor is routed through a following one of the adjacent ones of the plurality of second grooves and a preceding one of the adjacent ones of the plurality of third grooves". However, the specification (see Page 7, lines 16-20) only teaches to provide said plurality of second and third grooves so that the turns

Art Unit: 2879

of the coil will not be concentrated in only one of the grooves, and omits the level of detail presented in the claim.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 6. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ikeuchi (EP 0 572 192) in view of Murata (JP 06-168677).

Ikeuchi discloses a deflection yoke apparatus comprising:

a saddle-type coil bobbin 2 having a front end portion and a rear end portion (see Fig. 10);

first guide grooves formed in an inner surface of said coil bobbin and extending across the front end portion and the rear end portion (see Fig. 10);

at least one second guide groove formed in the front end portion;

at least one third guide groove formed in the rear end portion; and

a multi-wire conductor wound around said coil bobbin, the conductor being routed through said first guide grooves, said at least one second guide groove, and said at least one third guide groove.

Ikeuchi is silent regarding the limitation of "said second guide groove and third guide groove having a width in a range of 1.0 to 1.5 times a diameter of said conductor".

Art Unit: 2879

However, in the same field of endeavor, Murata discloses a deflection yoke having guide grooves in a range of 1.0 to 1.5 times a diameter of a conductor in order to improve the deflecting efficiency by regulating a coil winding position in an accurate manner, reducing winding deviation of the coil, reducing dispersion of coil distribution with every deflection yoke and reducing the possibility of generating corona discharge (see paragraphs [0011] and [0012]). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide guiding grooves in a range of 1.0 to 1.5 times a diameter of the conductor with the purpose of improving the deflecting efficiency by regulating a coil winding position in an accurate manner, reducing winding deviation of the coil, reducing dispersion of coil distribution with every deflection yoke and reducing the possibility of generating corona discharge.

The Examiner notes that Murata teaches to provide a groove satisfying the relation  $W_1 < W_3 < W_1 + W_0$ , where  $W_1$  is the width of the multi-wire conductor,  $W_3$  is the width of the groove, and  $W_0$  is the width of a wire of the multi-wire conductor (see paragraph [0010]). Murata further teaches the multi-wire conductor comprising at least two wires. For a case where the multi-wire conductor comprises at least two wires, and considering the width of said multi-wire conductor as 1, then the width  $W_3$  of the groove lies in a range given by  $1 < W_3 < 1.5$ .

7. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ikeuchi-Murata as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Osinga et al (US 4,484,166).

Ikeuchi-Murata discloses the claimed invention but is silent regarding the limitation of "said at least one second guide groove is one of a plurality of second guide grooves aligned in

parallel and said at least one third guide groove is one of a plurality of third guide grooves aligned in parallel".

However, in the same field of endeavor, Osinga discloses a deflection yoke with a plurality of guide grooves aligned in parallel with the purpose of allowing the adjustment of the length of the coils of the two deflection coil systems independently of each other at the values desired for a given deflection unit-display tube combination, which is important for realizing automatic convergence (see Col. 4, lines 64-68, and Col. 5, lines 1-2). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a plurality of grooves aligned in parallel in order to allow the adjustment of the length of the coils of the two deflection coil systems independently of each other at the values desired for a given deflection unit-display tube combination, which is important for realizing automatic convergence.

8. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Christiana et al. (US 3,601,731) in view of Hirota et al. (JP 01-151134).

Christiana discloses a deflection yoke apparatus 100 comprising:

a saddle-type coil bobbin having a front end portion and a rear end portion (see Fig. 1);

first guide grooves formed in an inner surface of said coil bobbin and extending across the front end portion and the rear end portion (see Fig. 2);

at least one second guide groove 136 formed in the front end portion; and at least one third guide groove 138 formed in the rear end portion.

Art Unit: 2879

Christina fails to disclose the limitations of "a multi-wire conductor wound around said saddle-type coil bobbin having a substantially circular cross section" and "wherein said at least one second groove and said at least one third guide groove have a width in a range of 1.0 to 1.5 times a diameter of said conductor".

However, in the same field of endeavor, Hirota discloses a deflection yoke comprising a multi-wire conductor having a substantially circular cross-section, said multi-wire conductor being wound around a saddle-type bobbin with the purpose of improving the winding precision by bundling in parallel multiple conductor fine wires without being untangled, therefore reducing winding deviation of the coil, reducing dispersion of coil distribution with every deflection yoke and reducing the possibility of generating corona discharge. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the multi-wire conductor disclosed by Hirota, since Hirota teaches said multi-wire conductor improves the winding precision by bundling in parallel multiple conductor fine wires without being untangled, therefore reducing winding deviation of the coil, reducing dispersion of coil distribution with every deflection yoke and reducing the possibility of generating corona discharge.

Christiana-Hirota is silent regarding the limitation of "said at least one second groove and said third guide groove having a width in a range of 1.0 to 1.5 times a diameter of said conductor". However, it would have been obvious to one person skilled in the art to provide said at least one second groove and said at least one third groove with a width of at least 1 time a diameter of said multi-wire conductor in order for the multi-wire conductor to be positioned in said grooves. Thus, Christiana-Hirota teaches a width W in a range ≥ 1 time the diameter of said conductor.

Art Unit: 2879

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 and 2 have been considered but are moot 9.

in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

**Contact Information** 

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to German Colón whose telephone number is 703-305-5987. The

examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday, from 8:30 to 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Nimesh Patel can be reached on 703-305-4794. The fax phone numbers for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-308-7382 for regular

communications and 703-308-7382 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding

should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0956.

July 2, 2003

NIMESHKUMAR D. PATEL SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER Page 7

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800